

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of December 28, 2007 in which claims 1-20 were rejected. With this paper, claims 1-3, 6, 8-11, 13-16 and 18-20 are amended, claims 7, 12 and 17 are canceled and none are added. The application now includes claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-16 and 18-20.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §101

Claims 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

With this paper, claim 15 is amended and claim 17 is canceled. The amended claim 15 is directed to a statutory subject matter. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-4 and 6-20 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by De Beer (US Publication 2003/0165227, De Beer hereinafter).

The present invention as in claim 1 is a method for obtaining network information associated with a selected telephone number. The method comprises: coding a request comprising one or more telephone numbers, transmitting the request to a network serving entity for performing a network information retrieval, receiving a response from the network serving entity, the response comprising network information identifying one or more network operators providing services to the one or more telephone numbers, decoding the response to extract the network information, and storing the network information in conjunction with the one or more telephone numbers (as currently amended). In particular, according to claim 1, the so-called network information comprises identification of one or more network operators providing services to the one or more telephone numbers.

De Beer describes a routing procedure for a telephone call, where a mobile telephone 20 sends a request message to a control center 7 after receiving an input of a

destination phone number. The control center replays with a response. The response includes routing data for the desired call, and the call is set-up using a modified phone-number based on the routing data.

The similarity between the present invention and De Beer is that both disclose sending a request containing at least one telephone number (i.e. destination number) (see Fig. 5 of De Beer) and receiving a response containing information related to the destination number (see Fig. 6 of De Beer). However, in De Beer, the information included in the response does not include an identification of the network operator providing services to the destination number.

As shown in Fig. 6 of De Beer, the response message includes header 61, routing data 62, dialing protocol data 63, limit of use data 64 and updating information 65. According to De Beer, routing data 62 defines a modified telephone call number for directing a call to the call destination, dialing protocol data 63 contains information required to correctly implement the modified telephone number, limit of use data 64 is conditional information including for example a time-out period determining the useful life of the response message, and updating information 65 (paragraph [0054]).

The Office asserts that the updating information 65 includes information of service provider (page 5, lines 10-13 of Detailed Action). In fact, the updating information 65 only includes information for updating information stored in SIM card 35 of the mobile telephone 20. This information includes the forbidden network table 3400 and the preferred network table 3401, and the service provider of the mobile phone 20 (not the destination telephone number) is selected from the preferred network table 3401 (paragraphs [0049] and [0054]).

With this paper, claim 1 is amended to specify that the response comprises "network information identifying one or more network operator providing services to the one or more telephone numbers." The added limitation was originally in claim 7 and claim 7 is now canceled. Other independent claims 9, 14, 18, 19, and 20 are amended according to the amendment to claim 1.

Based on the above, all independent claims are patentable. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection under 35 USC 102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Beer and in view of Tomiyori (US Patent 5,305,372).

Claim 5 depends from claim 3 and claim 3 depends from claim 1. Therefore, claim 5 is patentable at least due to its dependency to a patentable main claim. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claim 5 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the remaining claims of the application are allowable, and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. Applicant's agent urges the examiner to call to discuss the present response, if anything in the present response is unclear or unpersuasive.

Date: 3/6/08

Respectfully submitted,



Shiming Wu
Agent for the Applicant
Registration No. 56,885

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Tel: (203) 261-1234